

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14 and 15 are pending in the application. The Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 12, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chimoto et al. (US Patent No. 5,838,383, hereinafter "Chimoto") in view of Schindler et al. (US Patent No. 6,516,467; hereinafter "Schindler") and Battini et al. (US Patent No. 6,919,792; hereinafter "Battini"). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chimoto in view of Schindler, Battini and Trovato et al. (US Patent No. 6,469,742; hereinafter "Trovato"). Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trovato in view of Whetsel (US Patent No. 5,497,379), Chimoto and Battini.

Claims 1, 2, 12 and 14

In the Amendment filed on April 11, 2007, Applicants submitted that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Chimoto and Battini to produce the claimed invention.

In response, the Examiner argues that the combination of Chimoto and Battini is proper because:

Chimoto and Battini both disclose control systems that are used for controlling various components within the system (See Chimoto Fig. 1 and Battini Fig. 1). Both systems allow various components to be added or removed (See Chimoto Fig. 1 and Battini Fig. 1). Battini discloses the use of certain communications protocols between various components (See col. 4, lines 45-63) that provides a more efficient means of controlling devices by enabling the system to be compatible with HTML thereby enabling the system to use a variety of computer tools (See col. 4, lines 20-23). (See page 2 of the Office Action).

Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the reference as asserted by the Examiner.

For example, Chimoto is directed to a multimedia television receiver which has a plurality of decoder modules connected by a bus for decoding signal of various types, in which the decoder modules are selected in accordance with the type of signal to be decoded (column 2, lines 56-60). Thus, Chimoto discloses providing various modules inside a single apparatus (i.e., a television receiver).

On the other hand, Battini is directed to a method of controlling a plurality of domestic appliances, wherein each of the appliances has an associated descriptor comprising a set of HTML pages. (column 1, lines 50-62). A user interacts with the objects displayed on the screen and the interaction is converted into a command for controlling the appliance (column 6, lines 10-17).

Applicants submit that Chimoto and Battini are directed to entirely different fields of endeavor. Specifically, Chimoto relates to a television receiver (i.e., a single appliance) having different modules provided within the module and Battini relates to several appliances being controlled by a controller. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the references. That is, there is no reason why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the television receiver of Chimoto with the system for controlling various appliances disclosed in Battini.

Moreover, even if, *assuming arguendo*, Chimoto and Battini disclose control systems for controlling various components, there must be some showing of the obviousness of the claim as a whole, not the discrete parts to establish *prima facie* obviousness. However, the Examiner

appears to be selectively picking and choosing elements in hindsight based on Applicant's claimed invention without considering the references in their entirety.

Specifically, Chimoto discloses that the modules 303-308 are merely provided to receive and process different signals based on a user selection. Therefore, at the time the invention was made it would have neither been obvious nor necessary to modify the teachings to Chimoto to incorporate descriptors with HTML pages of each for each of the modules to be on screen as taught by Battini. That is, it would not have been obvious to modify the modules that are provided for decoding processing signals to include descriptors that will be displayed on a screen. In fact, Chimoto already discloses that a user can select between different broadcast signals and based on the selection the corresponding module receives and decodes the signal (column 8, lines 55-67). Furthermore, such modifications (i.e., descriptors with HTML pages) would teach away from the features of the television receiver disclosed of Chimoto.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that claims 1, 2, 12 and 14 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 4, 5, 7-9

Claims 4, 5, 7-9 depend from one of the independent claims that have been shown to be allowable, and therefore they should be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claim 6

Applicants respectfully submit that since claim 6 depends from claim 1 and since Trovato does not cure the above noted deficiency with respect to claim 1, claim 6 should be allowable at least by virtue of its dependency.

Claims 10 and 11

Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to combine the Battini with Chimoto for at least the reasons given with respect to claim 1.

Furthermore, claim 10 of the claimed invention recites the feature of “analyzing characteristics of the extension board, if it is determined in the step (a) that the extension board is electrically coupled to one of the connectors of the backplane; performing functions according to the characteristics of the extension board analyzed in the step (b).”

The Examiner asserts that this feature recited in claim 10 is disclosed in column 4, lines 20-26 of Trovato. However, Trovato merely discloses a module including a device driver for interfacing with a CPU and a protocol or a module including specific information regarding a software version and update. For instance, Trovato discloses “Modules 16 may include device drivers and protocols for interfacing with CPU 12 stored in memory 17”. However, this does not disclose anything about **analyzing** of the characteristics of the extension board in the main board as recited in claim 10. For instance, according to a non-limiting exemplary embodiment of the invention, it is analyzed and determined whether the extension board is a first type extension board or a second type extension board by referring to a register informing the structure of a PCI of a main board, or the extension boards transmits an MPEG transport stream (TS) or an analog video/audio signal, and functions are performed according to the characteristics of the extension board analyzed.

Therefore, the cited reference Trovato discloses the module including the device driver for interfacing with the CPU and the protocol and does not disclose the feature of analyzing the characteristics of the extension board if an insertion of the extension board is confirmed, as recited in the claimed invention.

In view of the above Applicants submit that claim 10 is allowable over the cited reference. Further, Applicants submit the claim 11 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1 and the additional features recited therein.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher R. Lipp/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Christopher R. Lipp
Registration No. 41,157

Date: August 25, 2008